

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

MICHAEL LAVOIE,

Plaintiff,

v.

TRANSWORLD SYSTEMS, INC.,

Defendant.

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

Civil Action No.

Jury Trial Demanded

**COMPLAINT**

MICHAEL LAVOIE (“Plaintiff”), by and through his attorneys, KIMMEL & SILVERMAN, P.C., alleges the following against TRANSWORLD SYSTEMS, INC. (“Defendant”):

**INTRODUCTION**

1. Plaintiff’s Complaint is based on the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act (“FDCPA”), 15 U.S.C. §1692 *et seq.*

**JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

2. Jurisdiction of this court arises pursuant to 15 U.S.C. §1692k(d), which states that such actions may be brought and heard before “any appropriate United States district court without regard to the amount in controversy,” and 28 U.S.C. §1331 grants this court original jurisdiction of all civil actions arising under the laws of the United States.

3. Defendant regularly conducts business in the State of Texas, and as such, personal jurisdiction is established.

4. Venue is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1391 (b)(1) and (b)(2).

**PARTIES**

5. Plaintiff is a natural person residing in Sachse, Texas 75048.

6. Plaintiff is a “consumer” as that term is defined by 15 U.S.C. §1692a(3).

7. Defendant is a national debt collection company with its corporate headquarters located at 500 Virginia Drive, Suite 514, Fort Washington, Pennsylvania 19034.

8. Defendant is a “debt collector” as that term is defined by 15 U.S.C. §1692 a(6), and sought to collect a debt from Plaintiff.

9. Debt collection is the principal purpose of Defendant’s business.

10. Defendant acted through its agents, employees, officers, members, directors, heirs, successors, assigns, principals, trustees, sureties, subrogees, representatives, and insurers.

**FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

11. Defendant placed repeated harassing telephone calls to Plaintiff on his home telephone seeking to collect an alleged consumer debt.

12. The alleged debt arose out of transactions that were primarily for personal, family or household purposes.

13. Shortly after the calls started, Plaintiff told Defendant to stop calling.

14. Defendant heard and acknowledged Plaintiff’s request to stop calling, but nonetheless continued to call his repeatedly.

15. Once Defendant was informed that its calls were unwanted and to stop calling, there was no lawful purpose to making further calls, nor was there any good faith reason to place calls.

16. Further, any continued calls could only have been placed for the purpose of harassing Plaintiff.



